

9. See the range of publications funded by the DEET Higher Education Division's Evaluations and Investigations Program, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.

10. This criticism and the discussion which follows from it do not apply to the Aboriginal Education strategies as explained in footnote 3.

11. See for example the foreword by Kim Beazley in Department of Employment, Education and Training May 1993, *Equity in higher education: a summary report. Institutional equity plans 1992-94 Triennium*, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service and Bowen in this volume.

12. See Department of Employment, Education and Training May 1993, *Equity in higher education: a summary report. Institutional equity plans 1992-94 triennium*, Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service.

13. The assumption that existing ability and potential amongst the equity target groups is currently being wasted by their under-representation in higher education has fascinating implications for existing entry policies which to

date have remained largely unexplored. In addition, in the context of the increasing diversity in applicants' previous education, training and employment experience, the trend towards adult re-entry to formal education, the promotion at a national level of credit transfer and articulation arrangements between higher education and training providers, the introduction of the concept of Recognition of Prior Learning, and the rapid and unexpectedly large up-take of the various open learning courses now available which have no entry requirements, together open up the whole matter of who should gain entry to higher education and upon what basis. See Bradley (1993), Gale and McNamee (1992), Gardiner (1993), Vivian (1990), Henry and Taylor in this volume and also Bartlett and Rowan in this volume.

14. This section has benefited from discussion with the Equity Plan Working Party of the University of South Australia.

15. Cynthia Cockburn's (1991) *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organisations*, London, Macmillan, is a notable exception to this.

Mainstreaming equity activities in universities: The next challenge*

Maureen Bowen

The University of Queensland

Abstract

Since 1988, and the release of *Higher Education: A Policy Statement* (1988), equity has been elevated to the central policy agenda in universities. The unambiguous linking of Higher Education Equity Program (HEEP) funding to the quality of Equity Plans produced annually as part of the Educational Profile process has proved to be an effective mechanism to encourage compliance with this centrally defined policy. However, the nexus between Equity Plans and the level of equity funding will become much less apparent in the near future when mainstreaming results in HEEP funding being rolled-in to the operating grants for universities. The next challenge for equity supporters within institutions is to ensure that mainstreaming results in no diminution of commitment to equity and that it be viewed instead as an opportunity to establish equity as a legitimate stakeholder in the institutional planning process.

Introduction

Equity activity within the higher education sector in Australia is not a new phenomena. Many institutions were supporting equity programs for a considerable period of time prior to the release of *Higher Education: A Policy Statement* (1988). However, what has changed substantially since 1988 is the requirement for institutions to be more systematic in the manner in which equity activities are undertaken, and this has impacted enormously on both the quantity and quality of equity programs that now operate in Australian universities. Equity has effectively been elevated to the central policy agenda within the tertiary sector and all institutions are now compelled to regularly review their equity performance as part of the annual educational profile process. Despite the considerable change which has already occurred, further change is just around the corner, and careful consideration needs to be given as to how equity practice will adapt to the new challenge of "mainstreaming".

This paper aims to examine recent higher education equity policy development with the emphasis being on identifying strategies which might facilitate the move to mainstreaming at the institutional level.

A brief analysis of equity policy

An analysis of higher education equity policy provides some useful examples of how educational policy can be effectively implemented. For equity practitioners, frequently located at a distance from policy development within their institutions, this may seem to be a purely academic exercise with little practical value. However, understanding how policy is implemented, particularly within the institution, is critical if one is to exploit the opportunities opened up by any new policy direction, including mainstreaming. Far from being irrelevant, it could be argued that it is important to locate practice within the broader context of higher education policy and its implementation at the institutional level if one is to manage equity activities most effectively "at the coal-face". The following provides a very brief analysis of higher education equity policy implementation. (No attempt will be made to analyse the content of the policy.)

Recent equity policy development has been but one element of an avalanche of higher education change announced in *Higher Educa-*

tion: A Policy Statement (1988). The tertiary sector has been altered dramatically since this document was released and it is within this context that equity policy has undergone rapid development. It is interesting to note the mechanism which has allowed this rapid change to be effected in the traditionally conservative setting of Australian universities.

For a major document such as *Higher Education: A Policy Statement* (1988) to be successfully implemented, it was apparent that there needed to be substantial Federal Government control over the tertiary sector. In the absence of constitutional control over education, the Federal Government needed to use some other lever to obtain compliance with its radical reforms. How then did the Federal Government acquire this control in the higher education sector when constitutionally, education is a responsibility of the States? The answer lies in the historical development of higher education since the late 1950s and could be distilled down to one very potent factor - funding.

From the time of the implementation of the recommendations in the Murray Report in 1957, through to the election of the Whitlam Labor Government in 1972, Commonwealth Government intervention in the tertiary sector had been increasing. With the abolition of tertiary fees for students in the 70s, the Commonwealth accepted total responsibility for the funding of universities, thereby relieving the States of their financial obligation to the tertiary sector. With institutions then totally at the mercy of the Commonwealth for funds, "manipulation" of the tertiary system to fit particular policy agendas became feasible.

The financial control over universities was not exploited to any great extent by the Commonwealth until the late 1980s when it was used extensively to gain compliance with *Higher Education: A Policy Statement* (1988). Smart (1991) protested this move strongly when he referred to the impact of what he described as 'coercive federalism'. Smart argued:

In effect, the Commonwealth Minister (Dawkins) has used the ultimate power of the Commonwealth purse to strip universities of their traditional autonomy and to coerce them into undesirable but binding agreements which do violence both to the quality of their teaching and research and to the concept of academic freedom (Smart, 1991, p100).

While not all would agree totally with Smart's condemnation of the outcomes of this process, it was apparent that financial control, described by Smart as 'coercive federalism', was the primary tool used to ensure the adoption of the *Higher Education* (1988) policy statement. Marceau (1993) refers to this form of control as 'steering from a distance' and notes:

Funding, its generosity or scarcity, source (public, 'core' or specific purpose) and the conditions of its obtention and use are critical developments in all aspects of higher education life. Financial control by public authorities is the key to 'steering from a distance'. The move is from administrative control to funding allocation decisions and the methods devised for the allocation of funds are governments' new tools encouraging a fractured and often recalcitrant system of enormous and increasing size to respond to new and changing public policy and socio-economic developments. (Marceau, 1993, p 24)

From a more positive point of view, some areas of higher education benefited from the influence of 'coercive federalism' and equity policy provided a welcomed example of this. As mentioned previously, although some universities had well established equity programs prior to 1988, many other higher education institutions made little effort to accommodate the needs of those who were under-represented in the tertiary sector. Even though the Commonwealth Government had introduced a submissions based incentive scheme of funding in 1985, the Higher Education Equity Program, progress in improving the equity performance of the tertiary sector as a whole had been patchy and uncoordinated.

The release of the *Higher Education* (1988) policy statement signalled an intent to develop a system-wide approach to equity policy and specific details of this policy were published some two years later in *A Fair Chance For All - Higher Education That's Within Everyone's Reach* (1990).

When reviewing pre-1988 equity performance in higher education, it seems unlikely that equity would have found its way to policy making forums within universities so soon after the release of *A Fair Chance For All* (1990) if the policy had not been accompanied by some degree of 'coercive federalism'. Regrettably, it was not until equity became unambiguously attached to funding that progress was made across the system as a whole.

In 1988, each institution was required to develop a document called a 'Statement of Intent on Equity', which indicated both current and proposed institutional equity activities. This was provided to the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) as one of the documents for the annual educational profile discussions in which institutional activities and resources were negotiated for the triennium. The formulation of this document was the precursor to the current institutional equity plan which has become a key resource for those who work in the equity area.

The equity plan was used (and continues to be used) by DEET as a means of measuring institutional equity performance. This "encourages" compliance with federal higher education equity policy, as set out in *A Fair Chance For All* (1990), and also provides a mechanism for the distribution of Higher Education Equity Program funds which ceased to be submissions-based in 1990. DEET makes no secret of this linkage between money and equity performance and the funding statement for 1992, *Higher Education Funding For The 1992-94 Triennium* (DEET, 1991) states:

Funding for equity in higher education is based on performance against targets provided in institutional equity plans. In allocating funds under the Higher Education Equity Program for 1992, account has been taken of an institution's equity achievements during 1991, equity objectives and targets set and the range of strategies planned to increase participation by priority disadvantaged groups for the forthcoming triennium. Assistance has been limited to those institutions which have demonstrated progress towards achievement of their targets. (Higher Education Funding For The 1992-94 Triennium, DEET, 1991, p17)

While the practice of "rewarding" or "punishing" institutions for equity performance was galling to some institutions, particularly those that had willingly initiated equity activities prior to the implementation of rigid reporting requirements, the preparation of equity plans had the desired policy outcome of focusing attention on institutional equity performance and forward planning in all publicly funded universities.

However, while 'coercive federalism' may have been an effective mechanism to encourage compliance with higher education equity policy to date, it has severe limitations in terms of securing long-term institutional commitment to equity activities. The nexus between equity plans and the level of equity funding is presently clear, but will be much less apparent when equity funds are mainstreamed to become a component of the annual operating grants. How then will equity "survive" the move to mainstreaming?

What is mainstreaming?

It would be remiss to develop this discussion further without defining briefly what is meant by mainstreaming. In the context of equity policy, mainstreaming has a number of elements including funding, planning and implementation.

In its crudest form, mainstreaming means the absorption of equity funding into the overall operating grants paid to institutions annually. According to DEET '...effective institutional management should place a priority on access and equity in determining the allocation of operating resources' (*Higher Education Funding For The 1992-94 Triennium*, DEET, 1991, p18), therefore making the rolling in of equity funds to the operating grant a logical move. However, the timing of such a development is critical as it relies on the second element of mainstreaming, that is, planning.

The mainstreaming of planning, as used in this discussion, means the incorporation of equity in the central university planning process. While many institutions currently develop equity plans, the degree to which they figure in the central processes of institutional planning and resource allocation varies considerably. Without acceptance at the institutional level of the value of equity activities, and their legitimate incorporation in planning and resource allocation, the mainstreaming of Higher Education Equity Program funds will be detrimental.

Fortunately, this fact has not escaped the Access and Equity Section of the Higher Education Division of DEET, as the following extract from the agenda papers of an equity workshop held earlier in 1993 demonstrates.

The Commonwealth recognises that there is little value in rolling in or fully mainstreaming funding until the commitment to equity is mainstreamed in institutional management and resource allocation. Further, there must be in place a satisfactory system to permit the Commonwealth to monitor institutional performance as mainstreaming of funding for equity must, in no way, be seen as a loss of Government interest in equity performance. (DEET sponsored Equity Workshop, May 1993, Papers for Agenda Item 6)

It is very reassuring to have this view articulated so clearly by the section of DEET responsible for the control of equity funding!

The final element of mainstreaming is perhaps the most difficult to achieve. It requires the integration of equity at the grass roots level of institutional activity where it is no longer peripheral or removed from the every day work of universities. It involves the acceptance of ownership of equity responsibilities at all levels of university "structure", not just within specialised units which might be established to meet the specific requirements of various target groups.

While these three elements of mainstreaming, namely, the rolling in of equity funding to the operating grant, the integration of equity planning within the central university planning process and the mainstreaming of implementation into the routine work of the university are interrelated, they pose quite different problems and challenges for the equity practitioner. Each will be considered in turn.

The mainstreaming of funding

As the previous comments indicated, mainstreaming of funding indicates the rolling in of Higher Education Equity Program funds into the operating grants of institutions. The decision to move in this direction has already been taken by DEET, but the timing is yet to be confirmed, as is the formula for funding that will be used to distribute resources. Initially, it was mooted that mainstreaming would commence in 1994, but concerns over the extent of institutional commitment to equity have delayed the process. For equity practitioners in those institutions where progress towards accepting equity as a central responsibility has been limited, this would be a welcomed relief. Where this applies, good use needs to be made of the extra time afforded by the delay to locate equity within the central university structure for resource allocation. The burning question is, "How can this be achieved?"

There is no simple answer to this question as the solution is likely to be quite specific to each institution and therefore needs to be

determined in light of the established institutional practices for allocating resources. In many universities, the process of resource allocation will be closely bound up with the forward planning process. Logically, this should be a reflection of the mission and goals of the institution, and the key to the process may well lie in moving equity into the central planning process. (This will be explored in more depth in the next section.) However, regardless of the individual mechanisms for funding, it is very difficult to access any funding process if that process is not understood. Equity practitioners need to make it their business to learn how funds are allocated within their institution, so they can determine the most effective way to make a claim for a fair share of resources.

Seeking advice from people who work within the system can be invaluable in this regard, as can locating an advocate at the most senior level possible to champion the cause for equity resource allocation. This observation is not intended to suggest that equity activities should only receive funding if they are supported by senior officers of the university. However, obtaining appropriate levels of funding for equity might well be significantly easier if such a supporter can be identified, particularly if their influence can ensure that a strong case for equity funding is made in the appropriate forums within that institution.

The importance of having support from senior officers is consistent with the results of research undertaken by Cockburn (1991) where the successful implementation of gender equity initiatives has been aided by support from influential positions in the hierarchy. It was also noted by Bowen (1992) in an analysis of equity policy implementation at The University of Queensland where both the Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor had taken leadership roles in the development and implementation of major equity policies.

When competing for resources at the institutional level, equity activities will need to make a "claim" for funding, as is the case with other areas of university activity. In order to do this, equity practitioners need to have clear goals for what they hope to achieve, and realistic budgets to accompany their plans. The requirement to produce equity plans is complementary to this process.

The mainstreaming of planning

The development of university equity plans is central to the mainstreaming of equity. It goes beyond the concept of merely securing funding for equity activities and provides the opportunity to "plug" equity into the central university planning process. Once accepted as an element of the annual university planning process, equity assumes a more secure position within the institution, and the dependence upon yearly Higher Education Equity Program funds reduces.

This process is most likely to be facilitated if equity objectives are clearly specified within the university's statement of mission and goals. If the university's mission and goals do not reflect any concern with equity, perhaps it is time that a review be sought! A case made for the review of an institution's mission and goals, couched in terms of wider higher education policy rather than in tones which might appeal to the altruistic nature of senior university officers, might prove more successful. Given the support for equity evident in major Commonwealth policy documents such as *Higher Education* (1988) and *A Fair Chance For All* (1990), it would seem that there is ample external evidence to encourage such a move. Likewise, the new policy developments associated with the quality debate might afford an opportunity to raise the profile of equity activities within institutions.

Encouraging the linking of an institution's equity plan with its central planning process is probably most easily achieved if some form of strategic planning process is undertaken at the institution. Each institution will have its own mechanism for central planning and, like funding, this needs to be exploited by equity practitioners. If the strategic planning process is open to wide consultation, the opportunity should be taken to submit concrete strategies for incorporation in the plan. Having well thought out equity strategies, supported by

relevant research where possible, will make equity plans more readily accepted within institutions.

This acceptance could be enhanced further if equity plans have been "validated" by passage through the university's usual system for establishing policy, for example, endorsement by the appropriate committee/s. In some universities, specific equity committees have also been established, and these can prove to be invaluable forums for both the discussion of equity issues, as well as direct involvement in the preparation of equity plans and their successful implementation. If the memberships of such committees are well planned, they can draw on a wide range of expertise from both equity areas as well as from mainstream university sectors, for example, academic boards or central administrations. Drawing on the expertise of persons who are not already closely aligned with equity can provide a different perspective to committee discussions and may also help give additional credibility to the work of the committee, particularly in the eyes of conservative members of the university community.

Equity plans are also likely to carry more weight within an institution if they are endorsed at the most senior levels. An equity plan that has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor or adopted by Senate is much easier to "sell" in a conservative setting than one which has emerged from a committee or office which might not be particularly influential within the university as a whole. While the internal structure of the respective university will influence this process significantly, once again, knowing the system and how to tap in to it is critical. Although the framework for equity plans devised by DEET is a useful starting point for the process of developing a university equity plan, each institution also needs to consider what is appropriate for its own internal planning processes. For example, at The University of Queensland, the equity plan is developed as one of the source documents for the institution's strategic plan. Its content is framed in a format suitable for that purpose and, as such, it does not specifically meet DEET's 1993 equity plan specifications. Rather than altering the internal plan to meet external reporting requirements, a supplement to the plan was developed to elaborate on aspects which required fuller explanation in order to meet DEET's requirements. The university's equity plan is, by design, a forward looking document that projects 5 years ahead to correspond with the university's strategic planning period. In order to meet the performance reporting requirement for DEET in 1993 the university's *1992 Annual Report on Equity* was also provided as part of the equity information submitted with the educational profile documentation. (The Annual Report on Equity is a document produced by the Vice-Chancellor's Equity Committee and it provides a vehicle for concise reporting on equity matters across the institution. It is endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor and distributed widely throughout the university.)

At The University of Queensland, both the funding of equity activities and the planning process have been integrated within the mainstream of university activity. This has been achieved through the development of the university's equity plan (by the Vice-Chancellor's Equity Committee) and its use as one of the source documents for the strategic plan which is designed to support the mission and goals of the university. University funding is then determined according to priorities detailed in the strategic plan. This process has now been in place for almost three years and is reviewed and refined annually as part of the strategic planning cycle. It is but one model for the mainstreaming of both equity planning and funding and it has proved to be effective within that institution. However, what works well in the context of The University of Queensland's planning process might be quite inappropriate if translated to another setting. The model clearly needs to "fit" the environment in which it will operate.

The mainstreaming of implementation

This aspect of mainstreaming is by far the hardest to achieve. It involves the widespread institutional acceptance and support of equity objectives in order to have policy implementation occur throughout the institution, not just through the efforts of designated equity practitioners. Mainstreaming of implementation requires acknowl-

edgement that equity is not simply a matter of access but involves the whole gamut of work undertaken by universities and cuts across their roles as education providers as well as employers.

In its simplest form, mainstreaming of equity implementation can be illustrated by activities such as the adaptation of existing infrastructure to provide additional support for disadvantaged students. Instead of re-inventing the wheel, equity activities are locked in to mainstream university facilities to make the most effective use of resources. This practice also has the effect of "normalising" the provision of support appropriate to the needs of a diverse student population. It becomes a part of good university practice, rather than an equity activity. While this approach might be impractical for some services, for example the provision of specialist support for students with disabilities, it can be a positive step towards having "so called" equity activities become mainstream activities.

However, universities do much more than merely provide support services for students. The core work of teaching and research, and the mainstreaming of equity into those activities, is a formidable challenge. In some institutions, responsibility for equity implementation is already being devolved to faculty or school level and equity objectives are encouraged in the formulation of their respective forward plans. This brings equity implementation closer to the site of teaching and research and might be reflected in practices such as the adoption of new pedagogic approaches or the review of curriculum materials in order to make courses less alienating to students who have been traditionally under-represented in tertiary education.

Perhaps the most obvious way to illustrate the need for this aspect of mainstreaming is in the area of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies. In the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training on *Priorities For Reform In Higher Education* (1990), the following comments were made in relation to Aboriginal students.

A prominent theme in evidence on this topic (Aboriginal students) was the importance of ensuring that the higher education curriculum does not alienate students from Aboriginal backgrounds, either because of its content or the way it is taught. A submission from the Victorian Aboriginal Education Association contends that higher education courses do not recognise 'the political, social and economic agenda of the Aboriginal communities from which their Aboriginal students are drawn, nor do they set up interactive processes with their communities to inform their curricula in ways that represent their agenda'. The Association urged reforms, but anticipated that this would be 'hard ground that lies ahead in the equity debate' since it would encroach on traditional areas of institution autonomy, in curriculum design, teaching method, and assessment procedures. (Priorities For Reform In Higher Education, 1990, p 114)

The real barriers to participation in higher education by disadvantaged persons might not be access or support, but *what* is taught in university courses, and *how* it is taught. As suggested in the quote cited previously, addressing this concern will be particularly difficult. Perhaps strategies such as including "equity performance criteria" in staff promotion processes or departmental reviews might stimulate some additional effort in terms of mainstreaming equity implementation?

The mainstreaming of equity into research activities within the higher education sector might be looking at equity and research the wrong way around. It could be argued that, instead of just encouraging more "mainstream researchers" to be investigating equity issues, equity practitioners need to engage in more mainstream research in order to inform their own work. This would be one very practical way of moving equity issues into the mainstream research sphere. Encouraging equity practitioners to access resources and facilities such as research grants or support infrastructure could be mutually beneficial to both areas of university work. The production of more theses and scholarly articles on equity issues, particularly to evaluate existing equity programs, could ensure maximum exposure to the results of both good and bad practice in equity activities. Surely this would be of

considerable benefit to those attempting to address similar equity issues elsewhere! While some areas of equity activity, particularly in relation to women, have made considerable inroads in this endeavour there is plenty of room for improvement.

In a recently released text edited by Cobbin and Barlow (1993), designed to assist novice equity researchers, the following comment is made:

Extensive and careful research is required to ascertain what are the important needs of various educationally disadvantaged student groups, to what extent these needs are being met, and to evaluate and compare efficacy of the different programs and schemes. (Cobbin & Barlow, 1993, pv)

Cobbin and Barlow (1993) have emphasised the importance of increasing research in the equity area and have also recognised the reluctance of many equity practitioners to engage in such activity. While many would argue that it is difficult to find the time to undertake research, they might already be doing so through, for example, the collection of data pertaining to specific equity activities, without consciously labelling it "research". Some minor alterations in the manner in which data are collected and/or reported could result in research that is more useful to the practitioner, and more accessible to others interested in the results of such work.

How can equity be monitored following mainstreaming?

Without the clear nexus between institutional funding and equity performance that exists in the current method of Higher Education Equity Program fund distribution, the problem of maintaining equity performance in an environment where funding is mainstreamed needs to be addressed. How will institutional commitment to equity be monitored?

While DEET has provided no clear indication on this matter to date, it appears likely that equity plans will continue to be the primary means of monitoring equity performance, even in a mainstreamed environment. Equity plans have become useful vehicles for mainstreaming, and they also perform the dual role of reporting on progress made towards meeting specific objectives. These functions need not change in a mainstreamed environment.

However, equity plans are not without their problems and a major concern held by many equity practitioners centres on the development of suitable system-wide definitions for the target equity groups. Research, including a project looking at the use of postcode methodology to identify socio-economic status (Jones, 1993), is currently being undertaken on this important topic. It is to be hoped that ample warning will be given to institutions when definitions are agreed, so that the necessary adjustments to accommodate data collection, for example, the design of enrolment forms, can be made at the institutional level. The results of DEET's deliberations are eagerly awaited.

Some stability in the DEET equity reporting requirements would also be welcomed by equity practitioners as these guidelines have changed each year since the introduction of the 'Statement of Intent on Equity' in 1988. Currently, the short time available between the receipt of precise details for equity reporting, and the deadline for the completion of educational profile documentation causes considerable unnecessary stress. It also imposes restrictions on the degree of consultation and debate which can realistically take place at the institutional level in relation to the contents and format of the document. If the same information were required annually, and agreed definitions for the respective target groups were also implemented across the system, the preparation of university equity plans would be less of a chore to those charged with the responsibility of compiling them.

However, having noted these shortcomings in the preparation of equity plans and suggesting that fewer changes annually would be appropriate, it would be naive to think that this will occur. The focus of the analysis of equity activities appears certain to shift from access to outcomes and the first stage of this was evident in the preparation of 1994-96 equity plans. Determining suitable measure for outcomes,

which reflect both quantitative and qualitative factors is a problem currently being confronted by both institutions and DEET and, while factors such as attrition rates and graduation rates might tell part of the story, there is much more to be gained from equity programs than can be measured by such factors. Add it to the list of challenges that face equity practitioners!

Conclusion

It should be apparent by now that there are no simple solutions to the problems posed by mainstreaming equity. However, there are also benefits afforded to equity by locating it within a more secure environment in the mainstream of university activity. Ensuring that equity becomes integrated into the institutional processes of funding and planning is the first hurdle. The hardest work comes with moving equity implementation into the mainstream. It would be useful if more examples of successful strategies used to facilitate this process were available to equity practitioners.

Even in an environment where equity has effectively been mainstreamed into all aspects of university activity, it is unlikely that the workload of equity practitioners will diminish. In addition to undertaking highly specialised activities, for example the provision of support for students with particular disabilities, their knowledge and skills will be required as a resource for the wider university population as equity becomes integrated into routine activities. Their efforts will continue to provide the impetus for further development in equity policy at the institutional level and it is likely that an important coordination role will also be required.

In some institutions, where equity is already mainstreamed into institutional processes for planning and resource distribution and, where progress is being made in the implementation area, the move to mainstreaming could occur tomorrow without ill effect. For these institutions, the potential decline of commitment to equity activities is less likely than in an environment where equity is held at arms length from the core work of the university. DEET is faced with the dilemma of determining the appropriate time to go to mainstreaming of funding so that current gains that have been made in the equity area are not eroded.

Footnotes

¹ See Tannock & Birch, (1976), for a detailed discussion of the constitutional responsibilities for education and the Commonwealth's use of the 1946 amendment to Section 51, to provide 'benefits to students', and Section 96 'specific-purpose grants', as the means of increasing their involvement in education.

Bibliography

- 1992 *Annual Report on Equity*, 1993, The University of Queensland, St Lucia.
- A Fair Change For All: Higher Education That's Within Everyone's Reach*, 1990, DEET, AGPS, Canberra.
- Bowen, M.H., 1992, *Higher Education Equity Policy - From National Policy to Programs in Operation: A Case Study of The University of Queensland*, unpublished Master of Educational Administration Thesis, The University of Queensland.
- Cobbin, DM & Barlow, AR (eds), 1993, *Tertiary Access and Equity Initiatives - A Handbook of Evaluative Research*, Evaluations and Investigations Program, DEET, AGPS, Canberra.
- Cockburn, C, 1991, *In The Way Of Women: Men's Resistance To Sex Equality In Organisations*, ILR Press, Ithaca, New York.
- DEET Equity Workshop, May 1993, Agenda Papers, Item 6, Canberra.
- Higher Education Funding For The 1992-94 Triennium*, 1991, DEET, AGPS, Canberra.
- Higher Education: A Policy Statement*, 1988, DEET, AGPS, Canberra.
- Jones, R, 1993, *Socio-economic Status of Higher Education Students*, Stage 1 Report: Assessment of the Postcode SES Methodology, Evaluations and Investigations Program, DEET.
- Marceau, J, 1993, *Steering from a Distance: International Trends in the Financing and Governance of Higher Education*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Priorities for Reform in Higher Education*, 1990, Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training, AGPS, Canberra.
- Smart, D, 1991, "Higher Education Policy In Australia: Corporate Or Coercive Federalism?" *Journal of Education Policy*, 1991, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.97-100.
- Tannock, P & Birch, I, 1976, "Constitutional Responsibility for Education in Australia: The Federal Government's Latent Power", in Harman, G. & Selby, L. (eds), *Readings in Economics and the Politics of Australian Education*, Pergamon Press, Melbourne, pp32-35.

^{*} This paper is a later version of one presented at the 'Equity and Access in Higher Education Conference', University of Newcastle, 5-7 October, 1993.